



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,141	04/09/2001	John W. Chrisman III	4826US	8520

7590                    01/23/2002

BRICK G. POWER  
TRASK, BRITT & ROSSA LAW OFFICES  
P.O. BOX 2550  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

PIERCE, WILLIAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3711	8

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,141	CHRISMAN, JOHN W.	
	Examiner William M Pierce	Art Unit 3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). 

**WILLIAM M. PIERCE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over what is old and well known in bowling balls in view of Shibanai.

As to claims 1-7, 10-19 and 20-31, bowling balls of nonporous polymeric termosetting resin is old and well known. Lacking in bowling balls is the use of a fragrance. However, perfumed polymers intended for the purpose of making articles with a fragrance are also well known. Shibanai teaches compounds to be included in synthetic resin products in order to enhance their smell. While there is no direct teaching of using his compound in a bowling ball, it has been held that, in evaluating a reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teaching of the reference(s) but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). Additionally, one must observe that an artisan must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose (see *In re Jacoby*, 309 F.2d, 513, 516, 135 USPQ 317, 319 (CCPA 1962). In line with this, one skilled in the art would clearly have found it obvious to have applied perfumed compounds, such as Shibanai's in order to make a bowling ball smell better. The amount of fragrance as called for in claim 8 is considered and obvious matter of choice depending upon how strong of a smell is desired.

Claims 9, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over bowling balls in view of Shibanai and further in view of Anderson.

Applying a pigment to polymer resin products to give them color is old and well known. Anderson teaches that it is old to apply a color that correlates to a fragrance in a product. To have done so with a bowling ball would have been obvious to one skilled in the art for the novelty.

**Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.  
Sprecker, Ceresko and Moscona show perfumed polymers and products.

Any inquiry concerning this communication and its merits should be directed to William Pierce at  
E-mail address [bill.pierce@USPTO.gov](mailto:bill.pierce@USPTO.gov) or at telephone number (703) 308-3551.

Any inquiry not concerning the merits of the case such as **missing papers, copies, status or information** should be directed to Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center at (703) 306-5648 where the fax number is (703) 308-7957 and the email is [Customerservice3700@uspto.gov](mailto:Customerservice3700@uspto.gov).

For **official fax** communications to be officially entered in the application the fax number is (703) 305-3579.

For **informal fax** communications the fax number is (703) 308-7769.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the **status** of this application or proceeding can also be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning the **drawings** should be directed to the Drafting Division whose telephone number is (703) 305-8335.



WILLIAM M. PIERCE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER